

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD

MINUTES - REGULAR MEETING

September 7, 2001

City Council Chambers
Port Angeles, Washington

SALMON RECOVERY FUNDING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair	Seattle
Larry Cassidy	Vancouver
James Peters	Olympia
Steve Meyer	Executive Director, Conservation Commission
Tim Smith	Designee, Department of Fish and Wildlife
Craig Partridge	Designee, Department of Natural Resources
Joe Williams	Designee, Department of Ecology
Shari Schafflein	Designee, Department of Transportation

Call to Order

Chair Bill Ruckelshaus opened the meeting at 8:05 a.m.

The Board was welcomed to the area by Port Angeles Mayor Larry Doyle, and Clallam County Councilman Steve Tharinger.

Chair Ruckelshaus thanked the area representatives for the use of the facilities and the Thursday tour.

Francis Charles, Lower Elwha Tribe, thanked the Board for funding of the Elwha restoration. Pat Crain, project manager, gave an update on the Elwha dam removal. The two dams will be removed starting in 2004.

Topic #1: Review and Approval of the SRFB Meeting Minutes

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve the May, June, and July SRFB meeting minutes as presented. Jim Peters **seconded** the motion. The minutes were **approved** as presented. (See notebook for details)

Topic #2: Management and Status Reports

Director's Report:

Laura Johnson gave an update on future regional meetings, including a meeting with the Oregon salmon recovery agency. The National Marine Fisheries Service is also looking at having a regional meeting on federal salmon recovery funds.

A presentation on Block Grants will be made at the October meeting.

Director Johnson gave a PowerPoint presentation on possible future Board grants categories. (See handout.)

Jim Peters asked when the Board could have a longer discussion on this topic.
Response: a workshop or planning retreat could be held in December or January.

Craig Partridge would like better information on need - why should the Board fund the different types of projects?

Shari Schafflein will highlight the gaps in the permitting process that Transportation and Fish and Wildlife have found in their streamlining process.

Chair Ruckelshaus: the Board needs to encourage incentives for landowners to do some of the activities.

Financial Management Services Report:

Laura Johnson presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details)
An update on programmatic funding was handed out. The Chair noted the awkwardness of funding programmatic activities that are under another agency.

Legislative Report:

Jim Fox presented this agenda item. No agency-request legislation is recommended by staff for the 2002 session.

Public Testimony:

Mike Kaputa, Upper Columbia: Discussed the need for SRFB to allow a lease program to use with orchardists since other grant options don't really work for the orchard type crops. Mr. Kaputa will bring a more detailed proposal to the Board at the October meeting.

Project Management Report:

Brian Abbott and Mike Ramsey presented this agenda item. (See notebook for details)
Several completed projects were highlighted in a PowerPoint presentation.

Topic #3: GSRO Report

Written report only. (See notebook for details.)

Topic #4: LEAG Report

Jay Watson gave the LEAG report. The LEAG met on Thursday, September 6, 2001. LEAG adopted operating procedures; elected its new chair and vice-chair; received a presentation from Bruce Crawford on the Monitoring project (the LEAG would like to be involved in this process); and worked with Joe Williams on wording concerning 2514 inclusion in the Board's funding strategy document. Mr. Watson thanked John Sims, past chair, and Mike Kaputa, past vice chair, for their work in the last year and for stepping in as the first officers. New chair is Jay Watson and vice chair is Shirley

Solomon. LEAG asked the Board how it can work with the Board to get ahead of the issues. LEAG plans to develop its next year's agenda items.

Mr. Ruckelshaus said the Board needs to remember to keep LEAG informed on actions early in the process.

Topic #5: Lead Entity Roles in the Salmon Recovery Process

Jay Watson gave an overview of what the typical current lead entity role is:

- Fill local coordination role
- Build consensus among groups with different agendas
- Work with local technical experts
- Work to meld science and community issues

Mr. Watson also pointed out additional roles different lead entities fill, such as watershed planning and nearshore project coordination.

The lead entities will need to work toward regional structures in the future. Each lead entity is growing (stretching) to cover the current activities and additional activities without enough funding.

Larry Cassidy commented on how the SE Washington group has pulled itself together. This group needs to be formalized soon. The Northwest Power Planning Council would like to use the regional structures in its watershed planning activities.

Watson noted that LEAG is not asking for money. They will show what they have been doing and will work to justify getting additional funding to accomplish the activities the Board would like the LEAG to perform the future.

Questions Watson posed to the Board:

1. *How can the LEAG work more effectively with the board, staff, state agencies and what should LEAG do to help?* Responses/comments included:

- Joe Williams: The Dept. of Ecology needs connection between the LEAG and watershed planning. Three items Ecology will be working on that will need LEAG involvement will include setting of instream flows (this will take a lot of time and coordination), amendment of water quality standards (this will include water temperature and fish standards), and aid with a panel to work on a watershed planning report to be presented to the legislature.
- Shari Schafflein: Next week the Dept. of Transportation will kick off the permitting process that includes a watershed investment component. The stormwater manual is being updated. Another issue is secondary and cumulative impacts. Need to continue to work on streamlining the permit work already in place. WSDOT has been working with Fish and Wildlife to set up workshops for the lead entities to explain the DOT permitting/mitigation process and how the lead entities can find projects to fulfill the mitigation needs. Jeff Breckel asked how to leverage SRFB funds to make the most of the mitigation funds; using the two fund sources could help make the best project in an area.

- Mike Kaputa: The Upper Columbia Board recently met with the Joint Natural Resources Cabinet and Larry Cassidy, Northwest Power Planning Council. The Upper Columbia Board stressed the need for consistent and adequate funding for the lead entity and regional processes.
 - Jim Peters agreed with Jeff Breckel's description of what a lead entity's role is. He noted that if the Board wants the lead entities to do more, then additional funding is needed.
 - Jay Watson will do individual follow-up with Board members to get a better understanding of the Board wants and needs from the lead entities.
2. *Who should the lead entities talk to about the successes to date and who will help build statewide support? How can the Board assist in supporting the lead entity activities and promotion of the lead entity work?*
- Steve Meyer said the lead entities are best situated to identify the key constituents in their areas. If the lead entities would like to have Board members attend local meetings, let the Board know.
 - Joe Williams agreed that the leads know who the key contacts are in the area. They need to talk to these people and encourage them to go to the local legislative representative.
 - Craig Partridge noted that the development of the LEAG itself will also help with the promotion of the lead entity work.
 - Jim Peters suggested developing a Q&A for use by newspapers and for the Board to have when visiting with local representatives.
 - Tim Smith stated that the main limiting factor for lead entities is capacity.
 - Shari Schafflein noted that through DOT's efficiency and streamlining work that it has been proposed to include "capacity building" in the mitigation plans.

Public Testimony:

Jim Buck, State Representative, offered his insights and history of the original salmon recovery legislation. Originally, the legislature didn't focus on regionalization, since it felt the lead entities would have enough to do with putting together each WRIA's limiting factors list and project list work plan. He commented it may now be time to review the legislation and revise it to meet the current needs. He expressed appreciation to the lead entities for all the work they have done to date.

Topic #8 - Monitoring Strategy Briefing – Bruce Crawford

Bruce Crawford gave an overview of the comprehensive monitoring strategy project. The Monitoring project is on schedule and involves many different agencies and groups.

Craig Partridge believes this project is an incredible opportunity; the difficulty will be keeping focused.

Joe Williams noted that this legislation requires that anything adopted by this project be implemented by Ecology.

Topic #6 – SRFB “Mission Roles & Responsibilities, and Funding Strategy” Amendments (Watershed Planning Subsection)

Jim Fox introduced this topic and explained that the Board had received a draft in its Board packet. Since the packet was mailed out, there have been additional amendments to this wording. A revised draft version was handed out to the Board.

Joe Williams commented on the draft and the importance of the watershed planning process. (See notebook for details.)

Public Testimony:

Will Hall, Snohomish County, and Doug Osterman, King County, presented testimony. They had additional changes and another suggested draft was handed out.

Andy Brastad, North Olympic –Would like to see stable funding for education and outreach programs along with monitoring efforts added to the strategy.

Discussion:

Larry Cassidy asked about the difference between “lead entity” and “lead agency”.

Response:

Lead agency is the entity leading watershed planning (Bill #2514) and lead entity is the entity leading the Salmon Recovery Funding Board activities (Bill #2496).

Larry Cassidy **moved** to approve replacement of the paragraph as presented by Will Hall and Doug Osterman and to change wording from “methodologies” to “multiple processes”. Jim Peters **seconded**. **Approved**.

Topic #9 – NWPPC Annual Report

This topic was presented by Larry Cassidy. He began his presentation by introducing Brian Walsh of his staff. (See handout for summary.)

Mr. Cassidy gave an overview of the report recently released by the Northwest Power Planning Council, showing project spending from 1978 to 1999.

Joe Williams asked how to get more of the funding into Washington State. Larry Cassidy noted this is not an easy question to answer but that there are plans to work on better applications.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

SRFB APPROVAL:

William Ruckelshaus, Chair

Date

Future Meetings: October 18 & 19, 2001 - Bellingham
 December 6 & 7, 2001 – Seattle
 February 7 & 8, 2002 – Olympia
 April 11 & 12, 2002 – Olympia (Funding Meeting)

ACTION ITEMS

MAY, JUNE, AND JULY SRFB MEETING MINUTES:

The minutes were **approved** as presented. (See notebook for details.)

**SRFB “MISSION ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES, AND FUNDING STRATEGY”
AMENDMENTS (Watershed Planning Subsection):**

As approved:

“The Board recognizes that work regarding water quality and instream flows will be undertaken through multiple processes, including watershed planning units under the state Watershed Planning Act. The SRFB will encourage the coordination of all related efforts undertaken by citizens through watershed planning units, other planning methods and processes, and lead entities. The SRFB encourages lead agencies and others who are preparing water quality and instream flow plans to become involved in the SRFB process by providing comments on the Board’s ongoing funding process and overall strategy, and by identifying projects through the lead entity process for funding.”

G:\TammyO\SRFB Meetings\September 6 & 7, 2001\9_6&7_01 Minutes.doc